



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,616 12/19/2000		12/19/2000	Lizy Kurian John	UTAU:1100RCE	5809
34725	7590	04/21/2006		EXAMINER '	
CHALKE	R FLORE	S, LLP		PAN, DA	NIEL H
2711 LBJ I	RWY				
Suite 1036				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75234				2183	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/741,616	JOHN ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Daniel Pan	2183
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE is is not of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	J. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fee This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Dispositi	on of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□	Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-10,12-29,31-38</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) <u>11 and 30</u> is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Applicati	on Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction to the output of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachmen	t(s)		
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/741,616 Page 2

Art Unit: 2183

1. Claims 1-38 are presented for examination.

- 2. Claims 1,2,8-10,13-19, 20,21, 23-27, 31, 35-37, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. (5,651,123) in view of Sourgen et al. (5,781,470).
- 3. As to the newly amended feature of within the microprocessor in claims 1, 20, 31, 38, Nakagawa taught a program control unit in a microprocessor (see col.1, lines 20-28), and also taught the preferred embodiment of program control unit in fig.4 which included random generator counter 30 (see col.7, lines 12-32). Therefore, Nakagawa's sequence generator 30 must be within the microprocessor.
- 4. Claims 3,4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. (5,651,123) in view of Sourgen et al. (5,781,470) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gupta et al. (5,490,280).
- 5. Claims 5,6,7,22,28, 29, 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. (5,651,123) in view of Sourgen et al. (5,781,470) as applied to claims 1, 20,31 above, and further in view of Williams et al. (5,530,837).
- 6. The rejections are maintained and incorporated by reference the last office action on 01/18/06.
- 7. The response by applicant filed on 02/10/06 has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Application/Control Number: 09/741,616 Page 3

Art Unit: 2183

8. In the remarks, applicant argued that:

- a) Surgen's pseudo random generator 8 is not within the microprocessor;
- b) Gupta disclosed a reorder buffer 507 downstream from the instruction decoder, and the combination of Gupta with Nakawa could be upstream of the instruction decoder;
- c) the combination of William with Nakawa could be upstream of the instruction decoder:
- d) Nakawa did not teach apparatus for allocating one or more resources within microprocessor to a decoded instruction, nor selecting one or more resource identifiers for allocation to the decoded instruction;
- 9. As to a) above, Nakagawa already taught random generator within the microprocessor (see fig.4).
- 10. As to b), c) above, examiner holds that both Nakagawa and Gupta and William were applicable for both upstream and downstream.
- 11. As to d), Nakagawa did not specifically show his pseudorandom resource identifiers allocation to the decoded instruction as claimed. However, Sourgen disclosed a system including a decoded write instruction and a generated pseudorandom value allocated for the decoded write instruction (see how the microprocessor decoded the write instruction, and generated the pseudo random value to activate the write pulse in col.6, taught an apparatus for allocating one or more resources within microprocessor to a decoded instruction, nor selecting one or more resource identifiers for allocation to the decoded instruction; lines 1-9, see the purpose of pseudorandom generator for write pulse in col.5, lines 58-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Application/Control Number: 09/741,616

Art Unit: 2183

to use Sourgen in Nakagawa for allocating the pseudorandom resource identifiers to the decoded instruction as claimed because the use of Sourgen could provide Nakagawa the ability to select the resource identifiers (e.g. Nakagawa's pseudorandom generated addresses) into a predefined level of processing, e.g. the decode stage, thereby reducing the waiting cycle for decoding whenever the instruction was ready for execution, and because Nakagawa also taught his pseudo random resource identifiers were generated based on a selection signal applied by a decoder which decoded a read instruction (see col.5, lines 1 1-16), and one of ordinary skill in the ad should be able to recognize that the resource identifiers could be applicable to the decoded instruction as the resource identifiers might have been the destinations address specified in the instruction already decoded, and for above, reasons, provided a suggestion.

Page 4

12. Claims 1 1,30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. None of the prior art of record further teach the combined features of the generation of the decoder stall signal by the resource identifiers selector issued to the instruction decoder whenever the one or more resource identifiers are not allocatable to the decoded instruction (claim 11), the comparison and the associating of the selected resource identifiers and the decode stall signal in response to the determination the resource within the processor corresponding to the selected resource identifier is not allocatable (claim 30).

Application/Control Number: 09/741,616

Art Unit: 2183

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Pan whose telephone number is 703 305 9696, or the new number 571 272 4172. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chan, can be reached on 703 305 9712, or the new number 571 272 4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 306 5404.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Application/Control Number: 09/741,616 Page 6

Art Unit: 2183

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

21 Century Strategic Plan